

lens system. The art of Yamazaki is used to show that the whole lens group or a part of a lens group can be used as a compensating lens group for the purpose of compensating image blurs.”

In the earlier Final Office Action of October 31, 2002, claims 1 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,025,962 to Suzuki (“Suzuki”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,000,549 to Yamazaki (“Yamazaki”). According to the Final Office Action, Suzuki fails to disclose the feature of claims 1 and 9 that only the negative lens component of the fourth lens unit is moved for compensating the image vibrations. The Final Office Action further indicated that “[e]ven though the zoom lens system provided by Yamazaki is a two-lens units zoom lens; however, in the lens unit selected as the compensating lens unit, Yamazaki teaches that the whole lens unit or just a part of the lens unit can be used as a compensation lens element. The part of the lens unit to be moved can be a negative lens subunit (I-1) or a positive lens subunit (I-2).”

Applicant traverses the rejection and respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness is not established. A criteria of a *prima facie* case of obviousness is that the cited references must teach all of the claimed limitations of the present invention. Applicant submits that this criteria is not met.

As Applicant has pointed out in the previous response (e.g., submitted on February 25, 2003), the zoom lens as featured in claims 1 and 9 specifically moves a part of the fourth lens unit of negative power so as to have a component of a direction perpendicular to an optical axis of said zoom lens.

As Applicant understands it, neither Suzuki nor Yamazaki show or suggest at least the recited feature of claims 1 and 9 (i.e., moving a part of the fourth lens unit of negative power).

As the Advisory Action indicates, Yamazaki merely discloses that the whole lens unit or just a part of the lens unit can be used as a compensation lens element. In other words, Yamazaki, as well as Suzuki, also fails to show or suggest moving a part of the fourth lens unit of negative power as specifically recited in claims 1 and 9 of the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicant believes that claims 1 and 9 are neither anticipated by nor rendered obvious in view of the cited art of record (i.e., Suzuki and Yamazaki), taken either alone or in combination.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1 and 9 is respectfully requested.

Applicant has not individually addressed the rejections of the dependent claims because Applicants submit that the foregoing places the independent claims from which they respectively depend in condition for allowance. Applicant however reserves the right to address such rejections of the dependent claims should such be necessary.

Applicant believes that the application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.


AUTHORIZATION

A petition for a two-month extension of time along with the associated fee is enclosed, extending the date for responding until March 31, 2003. Should an additional extension of time be required to render this paper timely filed, such extension is hereby petitioned and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any other fees necessitated by this Amendment, or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 13-4500 (Order No. 1232-4767). **A DUPLICATE COPY OF THIS SHEET IS ENCLOSED.**

An early and favorable examination on the merits is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN LLP

Dated: March 31, 2003

By: 
Matthew K. Blackburn
Registration No. 47,428

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN L.L.P.
345 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10154
(212) 758-4800